

Kess, Quinn

From: Johnson, Leslie L <johnsonll@cdmsmith.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2013 10:49 AM
To: Kess, Quinn
Subject: Senate Bill 103 (CT SB00103)

Dear Gentlewomen and Gentlemen,

I am writing to oppose the passage of Senate Bill 103 (CT SB00103) which is currently under consideration by the legislature. AS a CT resident and an outdoor enthusiast I use the CT roads for multiple activities including driving, bicycling, running, and walking. I firmly believe that the roads are there for all purposes and uses, and therefore we all need to respect the rights of others. I firmly believe that slower users (walkers, runners, bicyclists, farm equipment, scooters, etc.) need to keep to the far right when safe to accommodate faster moving vehicles.

Specifically to bicyclists, there already exists a state statute , CT General Statutes Section 14-286b, that states that a cyclist may ride two abreast except when doing so would "impede the normal and reasonable movement of traffic...". This gives guidance to cyclists, motorists and police regarding the balance of responsibility to sharing the road. There are a few occasions that cyclist may need to ride two abreast including;

1. A parent riding with a young child,
2. One bicyclist overtaking another,
3. Often times when crossing a signalized or Stop-sign controlled intersection, because the green light phase is short, and a group of bicyclists will often group together to get across the intersection promptly and not block traffic by a long single queue of bicycles.
4. Bicycle commuters often ride two abreast because they feel safer on busy urban streets. Many motorists still pass so close to a bicycle that you feel like you are going to be "clipped". And motorists do seem to be somewhat deterred by a larger "block" of riders than a single cyclist.

Socially and recreationally most bicyclists still ride two abreast fro camaraderie and conversation. Most try to stick to back roads, and many switch to single file when on a busy arterial. I agree that those offenders that block traffic on busy arterials should be prosecuted, but that is an enforcement issue! I know my bike club really tries to police itself regarding single file on arterials.

Remember, we are trying to promote:

1. Healthy exercise,
2. Bike-able paths and routes to work and school,
3. Outdoor tourism in CT.

If we follow the trend of this legislation – will we also ban:

1. Group rides of motorcyclists who often form long continuous lines of two abreast riders. I have waited at intersections for many minutes waiting for group rides of motorcyclists to pass on summer days.
2. Charity runs and walkathons where sometimes roads are even closed entirely to motorists. This has been happening increasingly with the popularity of triathlons.
3. Families walking in the street (there are many areas in CT that don't have sidewalks or don't enforce that sidewalks are cleared from snow).

Thank you for your attention to my concerns.

Regards,

Leslie Johnson
Branford, CT